

# COBBETT'S WEEKLY POLITICAL REGISTER.

VOL. XXI. No. 16.] LONDON, SATURDAY, APRIL 18, 1812. [Price 1s.

"Buonaparté promises the people of France an abundant harvest next year: and having already aggravated the existing scarcity, *by sending grain to supply the magazines of his armies in Germany*, he will drain the country of the produce of the next harvest, should it be abundant, *to feed the same armies*."—COURIER news-paper, 8th April, 1812.

"Such are the attempts (the hand-bills at Manchester) to delude and irritate the lower classes, and direct their hatred against their own government, instead of against Buonaparté. They who make them (the attempts), know that the evils which we suffer, could not be cured, but would be aggravated by peace. They feel that the war must be continued, and they would raise a civil war to palsy the foreign war."—COURIER news-paper, 10th April, 1812.

"We did hope that we should have had *only the disturbances in our enemy's dominions to record*: There is *there* some cause for them."—TIMES news-paper, 11th April, 1812.

481]

[482

## SCARCITY in FRANCE, and

## RIOTS in ENGLAND.

These are very interesting topics at this time, and it is of great consequence that correct notions should be entertained with regard to them, not only in this country and in France; but in all other countries. The smothering system has prevailed so long in England, that, really, at last, the world knows but very little of what passes here, and even we ourselves do not know much of it. As far as lies in my power this base system shall be thwarted. I will make all known that comes to my knowledge, because it is for the good of the country. I will place all that I come at in its true colours, as far as I am able. I will not only not lend my aid to the long-practised imposture; but I will do all that I can to expose that imposture, supported by means of a servile and corrupt press, the most efficient instrument in the delusion, the debasement, and the enslaving of a people.—There is, it appears, a scarcity of grain in France; and, it is well known, that there is a scarcity in England. Our hired news-papers have noticed both; and, it is my intention to let the world see what they have said of both; what their tone has been when speaking of the scarcity in England, compared to what it has been when speaking of the scarcity in France; how they blow hot and cold with the same mouth; how impatient they are to see insurrections in France; and how they are for instant punishment of every creature who dares complain in England.—But, it may be said, "why not let them alone with their falsehoods?"—Why? Why, because falsehood

ought never to pass undetected; falsehood ought never to pass in the world for truth. These falsehoods have, too, a tendency to injure the cause of freedom; they have a tendency to prolong the sufferings of Europe; they ought, therefore, to be exposed to all the parties concerned.—I shall begin with an article in the COURIER of the 8th instant, from which I have taken my first motto; and which, as the reader will see, is intended to inculcate the opinion, that, not only is there a scarcity in France, but that this scarcity has been produced by the war. Mark, reader, that the scarcity in France is held out to us as having been produced by the war. Bear this in mind. And, not only is the scarcity in France held out to us as having been produced by the war: but, the war is represented as being ready to swallow up the next crop as soon as it is gathered in. It must be sent to the armies out of the kingdom, we are told, and I beg you to mark it well. Nay, further, we are told, that the war has, in France, caused such a drain of men, that there are none but women left to till the land; and, that, therefore, the war, while it demands corn to be sent out of the country, lessens the amount of the produce by taking away the hands that ought to be left to till the land. This, you see, reader, is what we are told is the effect of war in France; and, we are therefore, told, that the people of France hate the war, and hate Buonaparté because he continues the war. Mind, reader, all this is in France, as we are told; but none of this is said of the war in which England is engaged. No, that is quite another affair.—After this preface, I shall take the publications, upon which I mean to com-

R

ment, one by one, beginning with that which relates to the scarcity in France.

#### SCARCITY IN FRANCE.

I shall first insert the above-mentioned article from the *Courier*, repeating here, that I deem the subject of great importance. The article is intended to deceive the people of this country as to several points. It is intended to make them believe, amongst other things, that the state of France is such, that a little longer continuance of the war will totally ruin her, and overset Napoleon. It is, in short, intended to delude the people of England to their infinite injury. It is intended to aid in the destruction of all that remains of freedom. It has all sorts of wicked purposes in view; and, therefore, I shall go into an ample exposure of it.—“The fact of a great scarcity in France, not only in Normandy, but in every other part, rests, not only upon the authority of private letters, but is confessed by BUONAPARTE himself in the answers to the Deputies from the different Electoral Colleges of France. Some persons may be astonished at the frankness of this confession, but the fact, we understand, is this:—“In reading the Addresses of the Electoral Colleges, as published in the *Moniteur*, one might conceive that there was nothing but happiness, prosperity, and abundance, a mild Government, and a contented people, throughout France. One is naturally, therefore, surprised at many of the answers returned to them, answers which so ill correspond with the tenor of the Addresses. But these Addresses have been the means of conveying to BUONAPARTE language and information of a very different nature from that contained in our public speeches. They have told him of the general scarcity that prevails; of the discontent that has been produced by a war that renders a continuance and aggravation of the public misery certain; they have represented to him that by the drain of the conscription laws, the land is chiefly cultivated by women (a fact upon which our readers may rely), and, therefore, inadequately cultivated in consequence of the feebleness of the hands that cultivate it, compared with those of the other sex. These facts the Addressers have communicated to him, and he touches upon them in his answers. He promises them an abundant harvest this year: and having already aggravated the existing scarcity,

“ by sending grain to supply the magazines for his armies in Germany, where there is the same scarcity as in France, he will drain the country of the produce of the next harvest, should it be abundant, to feed the same armies. Finding that there is a disposition to discontent and tumult, a disaffection to his person and government, he bids them beware of civil dissensions, and warns them, that nothing can recompense a nation for the calamities attached to a revolution; with the truth of which the people of France must, of course, be deeply impressed, by the calamity, consequent upon the French revolution, of having him for their Sovereign, with the Iliad of woes he has entailed and will still entail upon them. Finding, too, that there is a deep hatred of the war with this country, he attempts to remove it by the repetition of his promise, that the ocean shall be free, and that he is giving the law to us.”—The objects of this paragraph are, to persuade the people of England, that there are great miseries existing in France from the scarcity of grain; that the people suffer terribly from the war; that they, accordingly, detest Buonaparté; and, that we have only to go on, only to push on, with the war for another year, or so, and we shall overthrow him and get rid, at once, of all our dangers.—Such are the objects of this publication, and such have been the objects of thousands and hundreds of thousands of publications, since the Anti-jacobins began the war against France in 1793. They do not now foretel the fall of the French ruler on account of the assignats, as they did during the first four years of the war, and as was done by Sir Francis D'Ivernois and Mallet du Pan. No: they do not rest their hopes any longer upon the ruin of the finances of France; they have not the impudence to do this, while it is notorious, that France abounds in gold and silver coin, part of which consists of the guineas which have emigrated from England to avoid the society of our paper. They have not the impudence to do this; but, really, that which is attempted in the above paragraph is not much less impudent.—We are told, that, if we look at the Addressers of the Electoral Colleges, as published in the *Moniteur*, we should conceive that all was content and happiness in France. But, says the hireling, you must pay no attention to these, because it is a fact, upon which you may rely, that the Addressers

have told Buonaparté of the miseries of the country and its discontents. — Now, reader, what an insult is this to the public! What an opinion must this man have of the bulk of his readers! How does he know; how can he know, what the Addressers said to Buonaparté in private? How came he admitted into the cabinet of the Emperor? The attempt at imposition is too glaring to succeed with any but the most stupid and most credulous part of the community; but, of such is the mass of his readers composed; poor souls! whose comfort consists principally in believing lies!

— But, there is as much folly as falsehood in this publication; for, if the Emperor thought it necessary to disguise from the world, to keep out of the *Moniteur*, what the Addressers told him about the distresses and discontents of the people, how comes he to have caused to be published his own observations made to the Addressers, in which he speaks of his people's distresses? How comes he to have done this? He is, according to this good hireling, afraid that the world should know that he has been told of the distresses; while, at the same time, he voluntarily informs the world of the most pinching part of those distresses! This only wants pointing out to men of sense, to be seen in its true light.—The most interesting point is, however, the nature and extent of the distresses in question; and, first, as to the scarcity of corn, and consequent dearness of bread, which is a very important article of food every where, but especially in France, where the body-preserving, the filth-creating, and soul-degrading root, the potatoe, is known only to be loathed. That bread is dear in France there can be no doubt; but, is that a proof either of the badness of the government or of the disaffection of the people? That the dear loaf is a great recruiting officer in insurrections I know very well; but, is bread cheap in England; and will this writer say, that the people ought to be, or are, disaffected towards the government? We are told, that the price of bread at Paris is  $4\frac{1}{2}$  sous a pound, which is just about  $2\frac{1}{4}$  pence English money (sterling); and this is about half the price of bread, at this moment, in London, where it is rather more than  $4\frac{1}{4}$  pence a pound. There is, to be sure, a difference in the value of the money of the two countries. We pay for our bread in a paper-currency, which is depreciated about 30 per centum; but, still our bread is about 70 per centum dearer than it is in France. We must, however, not omit to notice,

that provisions are dear or cheap relatively to the price of labour, and that labour is higher priced here than it is in France. So that, perhaps, bread is full as dear, if not somewhat dearer in Paris than it is in London; but, I imagine, that the difference cannot be very material; and, it is always to be borne in mind, that Napoleon has the power of drawing from the North of Europe whatever grain can there be spared, while we shall now be shut out from that quarter, and, in all human probability, from the American States also.—We are told by this writer, that corn must be sent from France for the armies in Germany. Not, surely, to Pomerania and Poland; not surely to the borders of that Baltic, whence the corn used to come to England in such abundance? This is nonsense; but, if it were true, is it likely that provisions will be sent from France for the support of the French armies out of France, in a greater proportion than we do and shall send provisions to our armies in the Peninsula and the Mediterranean? Why, this wise-acre forgets our fleet apparently, where we have to maintain about 150,000 men from the produce of these Islands, and that, too, in a way necessarily the most wasteful that can be imagined. Yet, these writers do not seem to make any account of what the people of England and Ireland must suffer from this cause. Their compassion is confined, seemingly, to the French. Oh! they are monstrous hypocrites! And, they may be well satisfied, that, however they may succeed in cheating the people of England, they will have no success in cheating the people of France; who remember, that, in spite of all the hatred now expressed against Buonaparté, we once made peace with him; and they will believe, that our hatred of him arises principally from our fear of him, that is to say, from our fear of the power of France; and that, I take it, is no very solid reason for his being disliked by the people of that country, so famed for their love of glory and conquest.—We come now to a fact, which, one would have supposed, that even no hireling would have had the assurance to state. It is this: that, in consequence of the drain of men, occasioned by the war, the land in France, is chiefly cultivated by women! Mark this fact, reader! “The land is chiefly cultivated by women;” and, says the hireling, this is “a fact upon which our readers may rely!”—This is worthy of particular notice, as being a striking specimen of the imposture of these hired writers and of the credulity of this nation, the great mass of whom appear

never to think for themselves, and to possess none of the capacity necessary for the detection of falsehood.—Let us try this fact by the test of reason; this famous fact, upon which the readers of the *Courier* are told “they may rely.” The assertor produces no proof of it. He does not pretend to have been in France himself; nor does he produce any evidence, not even the evidence of fabricated letters or dispatches. Well, then, he has no grounds for his assertion, and I might dismiss it at once as false; but, considering that its object and tendency are to deceive the people as to the real state of France, and to encourage them to approve of a continuance of the war with a view to produce the downfall of Buonaparté, I will offer a few further remarks upon the subject.—The war, we are told, has so drained France of men, that the land is now chiefly cultivated by women. Now, reader, please to attend to a few facts. Napoleon, agreeably to the report laid before the Senate last year, has 800,000 men in arms. We are now to consider what is the population out of which this number of men is taken and kept up. The population of France alone, before the revolution, was 26 millions. Every one knows, that population keeps pace with food; and, when we consider the immense wastes, parks, pleasure grounds, &c. that have, during the last 20 years, been brought into cultivation; when we consider the effect of dividing large estates into small parcels, and making such an amazing augmentation in the number of land proprietors, all cultivating their own soil; when we consider that from 2 to 300,000 bishops, priests, monks, and nuns, who could not marry, and who possessed a good third part of the land and other property of the kingdom, have made way for multitudes of fathers, mothers, and children, now fed by the produce of that same land; when we consider these things, it is impossible not to conclude, that the population of France herself, if we were to go no further, is greatly increased. But, let us suppose it to have remained stationary, and to be still what it was before the revolution; that is to say, that it still amounts to no more than 26 millions of people. This being the case, France furnishes 1 man in arms out of every  $32\frac{1}{2}$  of her people.—And now, then let us see what this kingdom, this “United Kingdom of Great Britain and Ireland;” this kingdom with a long name, and which has, in the bombast of the news-papers, an “Imperial Parliament;” let us see what this kingdom

furnishes of men in arms: because, if we find that it furnishes more in proportion than France does, and if we see that the cultivation of the land has not fallen upon the women in this kingdom, we shall then have pretty good proof of the falsehood of what the *Courier* asserts with respect to the present employment of the women in France.—The population of this kingdom, including emigrants, blacks, lascars, and Germans, together with all the birds of passage for ever coming into and going out of it; including all these, our population may, perhaps, be swelled up to nearly 15 millions. Now, according to the army estimates of last year, we had in the Regular Army, including the embodied Militia, 382 thousand men; and, in the navy, 145 thousand, making, together, 527,000 men. In some of our boasting accounts, published in the news-papers, they have been called 640,000 men. But 527,000 we paid for. Some few thousands more, indeed; but, let us be within compass. Now, then, we shall find, that this kingdom (would it had a short name!); we shall find that this kingdom furnishes 1 man in arms out of every  $28\frac{1}{2}$  of its people; we shall find, that while the Emperor of France calls for one man out of  $32\frac{1}{2}$  of his subjects, our king calls for one man out of  $28\frac{1}{2}$  of his subjects; we shall find, that the drain of men is one seventh greater upon our population than it is upon that of the French; and, as we know very well, that this drain has not thrown upon the women the cultivation of the land in England, we must, if we would be thought rational men, conclude, that this story about the cultivation of the land in France by women is a falsehood; a sheer invention for the purpose of deceiving the people of this country, and of favouring the views of those who delight in war, because it enriches them and their families.—“But,” exclaims the reader, “you have forgotten!” Oh! no, I have not forgotten! I have not forgotten that Old France contains but a part of that population, out of which Napoleon draws his 800,000 men; I have not forgotten, that he is king of Italy, that Holland and Brabant and the Hans Towns and part of Germany belong to his empire; and that he not only draws, troops from all these, but from the more distant parts of Europe governed by sovereigns his allies. Oh! no; I have not forgotten that his empire contains upwards of 40,000,000 of people, instead of 26,000,000; but I had a mind to shew how the comparison stood with

France alone, in order to put this hireling the more completely to shame.—Take, then, Napoleon's empire at 40,000,000 of people, which is far within bounds, and you will find, that he takes but one man in arms out of every 50 of his people; while our king takes one man in arms out of every  $28\frac{1}{2}$  of his people! And yet, this hireling has the impudence to attempt to make us believe, that the drain of men in France has thrown the cultivation of the land upon the women! If scarcity and discontent be produced in France by a drain of one out of fifty, what must the drain of one of twenty-eight and a half produce? Thus does this hireling strike into the bowels of his own government, when he is aiming the blow at that of Napoleon. But, such is the desire to decry the government of France; so eager the desire to make the people here believe that the French are slaves, that the consequence of such efforts to our government are wholly overlooked.—So much for this fact, upon which, he says, his readers may rely.—Let us now go to another. He tells us, that Buonaparté finds, that "there is a disposition to discontent and "tumult, and a disaffection to his person "and government." No proof of this is attempted; but, it is hinted, that this is likely on account of the woes, as they are called, which Buonaparté has brought upon France. I should like to hear these woes described in detail. Was it a woe to rid France of the government of the Directory? But, the tough fact is, we made peace with this man, and I saw his name shining in a transparency over the head of a most loyal Lord Mayor of London, in the Guildhall. Aye, and we said, Pitt himself said it, that under Buonaparté France had become a country fit to live upon terms of amity with. What are these woes then? What does this "Iliad of woes" mean? Has France experienced any convulsions since we so applauded Buonaparté? Has she suffered any particular miseries during this war? Has she discovered any symptoms of weakness? Has she been beaten, or has she sustained any disgrace?—These questions will call to the mind of the reader that career of glory which France has run during the present war, since the time that Napoleon was an object of our praise; and barely to think of that career is sufficient to convince any one of the folly of supposing that there can exist, in France, any disaffection to the person and government of the Emperor.—It is stated, in conclusion, that Na-

poleon finds, that there is, in France, "a "deep hatred of the war with this country." No proof again! These hirelings do not deal in proof or argument: assertion is their gift; and that they do not spare. That the people of France may wish an end to the war is very probable; and the more so, as there are not, and cannot be, many families, comparatively, fatten-  
ing upon war. The war does not cost the subjects of Napoleon more than about one-fifth as much per head as it costs us. Yet, I do not say, that they do not wish for peace. They know that they can be secure in peace. They know that they will be in no danger of being subdued in peace. But, I have not been able to discover in them any objection to a war with us. The war appears to be very popular, and always has so appeared. When the Courier produces us any proofs of the contrary, it will be time enough to believe what he says.—Thus have I gone through this miserable attempt at deceiving the people. I see such things almost daily in the hireling prints; and I know that they have, in part, their intended effect; but, one cannot be constantly employed in exposing them.—These, and such as these, are the means, or, rather, one set of the means, by which the nation has been brought to its present desperate state; into a state, where it hardly expects triumph in war, and fears to make peace. A corrupted press has been the instrument of continual deception for 20 years. It is rather more than 20 years since it began its work of delusion. France, from the early part of the year 1792, was, by all the hired part of the English press (much the largest part), represented either as just going to pieces, or hostile to her rulers. The assignats served as the foundation for predictions of her ruin for three or four years; then she was to be devoured by factions; then she was to be subdued by Suvaroff; then the French were to return peaceably to the Bourbons, and be as gentle as we ourselves. Every year, every month, had its prediction. They all proved false; and we have had to pay the price of our own folly in believing them, and to pension the prophets into the bargain. This was rather hard; but we deserved it. D'Ivernois' pension ought to be remembered as long as the word pension is understood in the world. This man, who is a Switzer, I believe, wrote and published numerous pamphlets upon the finances of France; all of them intend to make the people of this country believe, that, in

consequence of their poverty, the French would be compelled to yield, or, at least, to draw themselves within their former limits, and to recal the House of Bourbon. All his predictions failed; but he himself did not fail; for he obtained from the minister, Pitt, whom he constantly extolled to the skies, a knighthood; and, which was a great deal worse for us, a pension of £200. a year, which he has been receiving ever since October, 1800. Of a similar sort was the pamphlet of the Rev. Herbert Marsh; and he has had, since May, 1804, a pension of £514. a year! Thus, has this nation not only been deceived by these writers; but it has paid, and is still paying, most dearly, the persons who were the instruments in the deception. And these are amongst the benefits that we derive from this press!

#### RIOTS IN ENGLAND.

When the hireling of the *COURIER* was writing so blithely about the scarcity in France, and about the disaffection towards the Emperor and his family, it little thought how soon it would have to give account of transactions like those at Manchester, Carlisle, Bristol, Truro, Leeds, &c. He hoped, I suppose, like the hireling of the *TIRES* news-paper, that he should have "no such disturbances to record, but those which would take place in France." This brave, liberal, and a christian-like hope has been disappointed; and these hired personages have been compelled to record distresses and disturbances in England, instead of distresses and disturbances in France.—The accounts which I myself have received, from Carlisle, where the poor woman was shot, and from Manchester, where some of the people were sabred, are very different indeed from those published by the *TIRES* and the *COURIER*. But, I do not choose to make use of my own intelligence. I do not choose to expose myself to the charge of sending exaggerated statements to the Continents of Europe and America. I will take the accounts, which the hirelings themselves have been pleased to give us; and let the world judge from them.—There have been riots at Manchester, Carlisle, and other places. At all, but the first, on account of the high price of provisions; at Manchester, on account of an attempt to send a flattering address to the Prince Regent. This last is a most interesting topic; and, I shall, accordingly, enter into it very fully, in order that the

whole of the circumstances may be well understood in every part of the world.

—The order, in which I propose to proceed is this: first, to insert accounts of the riots arising from the high price of provisions; second, to make such remarks upon those accounts as may appear necessary; third, to insert the accounts of the riot at Manchester; and, fourth, to take the commentaries of the hired writers thereon, and answer those commentaries.

#### RIOT AT BRISTOL.

"A Gentleman just arrived in town from Bristol, informs us, that some disturbances took place in that city the last market-day, on account of the dearness of provisions. Potatoes had been on the rise for some time previous; and the farmers who had several waggon-loads at the market, were attempting to advance their price, when a mob assembled, and threatened them with their vengeance. Some of the respectable inhabitants of the town in consequence interfered, and endeavoured to appease the mob by promising to prevail on the farmers to sell the potatoes at the price of the previous market day. In this they were unsuccessful; and the consequence was, that the mob seized the provisions in spite of every opposition, and either destroyed or carried away the whole." *TIRES*, 11th April, 1812.

#### RIOT AT CARLISLE.

"In treating upon the subject of the riot, it is our intention merely to state the leading facts. The late proceedings of the populace, we believe, originated in three causes: The very low wages of our manufacturing poor; the dearness of every necessary article of life, and the late artificial scarcity, which has been produced by agents from Liverpool, &c. who have bought up, at very advanced prices, all the grain in the market.—On Saturday last the bread corn was bought up in a few minutes; consequently many of the heads of families were disappointed, and obliged to return home empty. Apprehensions being entertained that the same agents were at work in buying up potatoes, some carts loaded, were seized by the populace, who sold them at reduced prices. Early on Monday morning great quantities of corn were brought from depots of the corn buyers to the port of Sandsfield, five miles distant. The populace, unable

"to endure the sight of so much grain passing by their doors, whilst themselves and families were in want, proceeded to the vessels, and pressed several carts, loaded them, and were about to return, when the Magistrates and the soldiers of the 55th arrived. We understand that the Magistrates, after having promised that the markets in future should be duly regulated, and the propositions of advancing the wages of the manufacturing poor, should have their consideration, the populace relinquished their booty and returned home.—The populace appeared perfectly satisfied with the assurances of the Magistrates, who are said to have promised to use every exertion to prevent forestalling. All terminated quietly at Sandsfield, except that some of the Magistrates and Officers were assailed in the suburbs on their return, by women and boys with a few stones. The soldiers were marched up to the market-place, and followed by an immense concourse of people; many, no doubt, attracted by curiosity. Some of the Officers were hissed and hooted at on their retiring, when they suddenly wheeled, drew their swords, and ran to their men, who were still under arms, and ordered them to clear away the populace, BY WHICH MANY WERE WOUNDED. The mob, as if momentarily appalled, did not farther incommoded them, and the Officers went to mess, leaving the soldiers under arms. After the lapse of a few minutes, the populace assembled in great numbers before the mess-room, broke the windows, and threatened vengeance to the Officers. On this the Riot Act was read. Some rounds, it is stated, were afterwards fired, by WHICH A WOMAN WAS KILLED, [said, in other papers, to have been with child] and SEVERAL MEN WOUNDED; and most of the houses in the market-place exhibited some mark of the firing.— On Tuesday the examination of thirty-eight persons was held, who, with the exception of two or three, who were charged with having thrown stones, were all discharged. On that day the Coroner's Inquest was taken on the unfortunate woman, when the Jury, after long deliberation and continued differences of opinion, returned a verdict of accidental death.—All is now quiet."

## RIOT IN CORNWALL.

"Truro, April 11.—We observed last

"week some symptoms of commotion among the Miners; the first and most pernicious effect of which was, to alarm the farmers and dealers in grain, potatoes, &c. and to check the open sale and free circulation of provisions through the country; and, the action and re-action of the two evils heightening each other, till Saturday and Sunday last, the workmen at several of the mines then resolved to stop working till they were supplied. This could not be done at the moment. They assembled in groups of considerable numbers, in the quarter between Redruth and Truro, and then dispersed over the country with their empty sacks, to purchase corn among the farmers.— On Monday, about noon, they began to enter Truro, not in crowds or riotously, but scatteringly. Very few of them looked like fathers of families.—Indeed, the far greater part of them were boys, youths, and no small number of *bal* girls (as the girls are called who work about the mines) and seemed rather to have come in from the effect of curiosity and idleness; having been thrown idle by the stopping of the works, at the instigation of some of those amongst them who are not distinguished for the best conduct on other occasions. However, we must do them the justice to say, we could not have conceived so many of them would quit their work under such circumstances, and shew less irritation, or do so little mischief. We are not singular in this opinion. The precautionary measures taken, and the apprehensions they gave rise to, formed the most serious part of the business. The leading men in most of the populous parishes, had already, as we have said, exerted themselves to meet the evil, and apply all possible relief.—The next duty of Magistracy was to protect property and preserve the public peace, and that, rather by awing the turbulent, than contending with them. With this view, our worthy High Sheriff signed an order for the march of a part of the Monmouth and Brecon regiment, under Sir Samuel Fludyer, from Falmouth to Redruth.—All was quiet to-day at Redruth market, where, however, about 100 of the Welch regiment still continue, and the remainder having returned to Falmouth, with the arms of the Stanley Artillery regiment, to be lodged in Pendennis Castle. A letter received this evening from a respectable friend in Illogan, says, that all the Miners are

“ returned to their duty. All that can be done, is done or doing already. Two large cargoes of American flour now in Falmouth, are expected to be landed there, and several other cargoes are also expected from America, besides Barley from other parts. The miners may depend upon it, that the Magistrates are doing all in their power to relieve them on the one hand, and on the other to punish the ringleaders in any further disorders, and preserve peace and security at any rate.”

#### RIOTS IN YORKSHIRE.

“ *Leeds, April 11.*—Last Sunday night, about twelve o'clock, a number of armed men, with their faces covered, entered the workshop of Mr. Smith, of Snowgate-head, near Holmfirth, in the neighbourhood of Huddersfield, and broke all his dressing-frames and shears. They proceeded from thence to Horn Coat, about a mile distant, entered the dressing shop of Mr. Jos. Brook, and not content with breaking his frames and shears, which they entirely destroyed, they broke and demolished his household furniture and all the windows. From thence they proceeded to Reins, near Honley, about three miles further, where they arrived about two o'clock, and entered the workshop of Mr. James Brook, and broke one frame, which was all he had, and which had been taken down about five weeks. At the earnest entreaty of Mr. Brook, they were prevailed upon not to break his shears.—We regret to have to record one of the worst cases which has occurred since the commencement of that terrible system of depredation, which has spread alarm through this manufacturing district, both as it respects the number concerned in it, and their wanton and outrageous conduct.—On Thursday night, about 12 o'clock, the extensive cloth manufacturing of Mr. Joseph Foster, of Horbury, near Wakefield, was surrounded by a large body of armed men, who, after securing all the approaches to the premises, proceeded to break into that part of the mill appropriated to the dressing of cloth, where they completely destroyed all the shears and frames; the former were not merely snipped, but absolutely broken in pieces. They then demolished all the windows, and, as if actuated by the most diabolical frenzy, broke into those parts of the premises against which these depredators do not pretend to have any ground of complaint,

“ the scribbling mill and weaving shops, and materially injured the machinery, and wantonly damaged a quantity of warp ready for the loom, destroyed not merely the glass of the window, but the frames, which were of cast iron, the windows of the dye-houses, the counting-house, and even the dwelling-houses contiguous to the workshop shared the same fate.—At the commencement of these dreadful outrages, a detachment from the main body invested the dwelling-house occupied by Mr. Foster's sons; they literally shivered the door in pieces, and broke both the window and frame, proceeded to the lodging-room of the young men, and demanded the keys of the building, under pain of instant death. They dragged two of them out of bed, and tied them together, making them lie naked upon the floor: the other they compelled to accompany them with the keys, but this last outrage was quite unnecessary, as many practicable breaches had been already made in the building, and a considerable progress made in the work of destruction. The dwelling-house occupied by the book-keeper was also broken into, and his family treated with the most brutal violence; and to complete the full measure of their guilt, they afterwards set fire to the building, but which was happily extinguished, after their departure, before it communicated to the main body of the building, but not before very considerable damage had been done.—These lawless men having accomplished their object, assembled in a neighbouring field, when the leader called over their numbers, to which each individual answered. Having ascertained that their whole number was there, said, “ the work is done, all is well, disperse;” which order was obeyed.”

Such are the accounts that have been published respecting these riots. It was natural enough for the Editor of the Times to express his disappointment at having to record riots of this sort in England, when he so fondly and humanely hoped that he should have to record no disturbances, except such as would take place in France.—When the Courier hireling was painting the misery of France as arising in part out of the sending of corn out of the country to feed the armies, he did not, I dare say, imagine, that he should so soon have to record, that the people of Carlisle had endeavoured to prevent corn and potatoes from being shipped away from their part of

the country.—This may operate as a caution to the hirelings in future; who, when they are contriving against Napoleon, should, at any rate, take care, that they do not strike their friends.—There appears to have been some serious work at Carlisle. We are told, that “many were wounded” before the attack upon the mess-room; and that, afterwards, “a woman was killed, “several men wounded, and that most of “the houses in the market-place exhibited “some marks of firing.”—Now, seeing that this was the case, and seeing that soldiers are called out upon all such occasions, as at Nottingham, Manchester, &c. I beg leave to suggest to the hirelings of the *Times*, the *Post*, and the *Courier*, whether they are not rather indiscreet in railing so vehemently against the use of troops for similar purposes in France; seeing, that ignorant people, the “lower classes,” the “populace,” the “mob,” may not be able to see why the invectives made use of against the employment of a military force in that country should not be applicable to the employment of a military force, for similar purposes, in this country. I beg leave to suggest this to these hirelings. The invective against Napoleon is, of course, very good, and against our government good for nothing; but, the ignorant part of the people, the “lower classes,” may not be able to discern the grounds of the distinction; and, therefore, I should think, that, just at this time, if the hirelings should hear of such an use being made of soldiers in France, they will do well to say as little as possible upon the subject; for, as to defending, or excusing, any thing done by Napoleon, that is quite out of the question.—Napoleon’s is called a “military despotism.” Upon some other occasion I will inquire into the meaning of these words. I will shew what a “military despotism” is. At present, I have not time for that.—The *Times*, in speaking of the extent of the danger from the riots, coolly observes: “we would not wish the public to apprehend more from them, or in them, than there really is. They are mere Mob Riots, which, resulting from disorderly force, are to be suppressed by a force that is ordered and organized.” With what perfect coolness; with what sang-froid; with what a disregard of the lives of the people this must have been written! The man who wrote this must look upon the mass of the people as little better than brutes, and must regard the soldiers as raised and kept in pay for the purpose of making war upon them. You

hear from him no expression of sorrow at the death of this poor woman, who has, perhaps, left a family of children. All is defiance on his part; all hostility towards the people. Is this the sort of feeling that an Englishman ought to have upon the perusal of news like this? He, alas! knows not what it is to feel hunger, and to hear children crying for bread.

#### RIOTS AT MANCHESTER.

The account given of this riot (as it is called) is as follows, in the form of a letter to the Editor of the *Courier*, dated Manchester, 8th April, and published in that paper of the 10th instant.

“Sir—As various and exaggerated accounts will no doubt get into circulation respecting the unpleasant occurrences here to-day, I take the liberty of sending you a statement, upon the truth of which you may depend. About a fortnight since, a requisition most respectfully signed by 154 of the principal inhabitants, was addressed to the Borough-reeve and Constables, “to convene a public Meeting of the Inhabitants of the towns of Manchester, Salford, and the neighbourhood, to prepare a dutiful and loyal Address to his Royal Highness the PRINCE REGENT, expressive of the strongest assurances of our attachment to his Royal Person, and of our ardent zeal for the support of his Government.”—A meeting was, in consequence, appointed to be held in the Dining-room, at the Exchange Buildings, this day at eleven o’clock. In the mean time, several most inflammatory hand-bills were posted up in the town and neighbourhood. One contained a copy of the Address of the Livery of London! Another, which was circulated with the greatest industry for many miles round, I send you a copy of at foot. This will shew you, that instead of leaving the discussion of the question to the well-informed part of the inhabitants (as had always been the custom before), no pains were spared to work upon the passions, and to mislead the judgment of the lower orders. The present feelings, however, of those who had recourse to these vile expedients, no honest man will envy! In consequence of these proceedings the Committee of the Exchange Rooms became, with reason, alarmed for the safety of the stair-case leading to the Dining-room, and declined permitting the Meeting to be held there. Disappointed of the usual place of meeting, the Borough-reeve and Constables applied

" for the large room at the Bull's Head Inn; " but being again refused, they felt reduced " to the necessity of giving notice by hand- " bills that the Meeting could not take " place. Early this morning, however, " great numbers of the working classes be- " gan to assemble, and after loitering in " groups for some time, part of them, with- " out ceremony, entered the Exchange " Room, where the merchants meet on bu- " siness (not the dining-room), and others " assembled tumultuously in St. Ann's " Square. This scene lasted upwards of " an hour: and it is some consolation to " observe, that however active *certain indi-* " *viduals* had been in bringing the rabble " together; not a man above their own " rank dared appear in the crowd to give " them any countenance. At length some " of the mob broke open the door of the " Exchange dining-room, and took forcible " possession. From the breaking of " doors they naturally proceeded to break- " ing windows, the whole of which, toge- " ther with the chairs, tables, chandeliers, " maps, and a valuable likeness of our wor- " thy Representative, Col. Stanley, were " quickly demolished. Immediately after " this the Riot Act was read, and the pro- " per time having elapsed, the military " dispersed the mob. I do not hear of any " accident of consequence, and have little " doubt but tranquillity will be now re- " stored. The damage done to our new " and elegant Exchange is considerable. " A few of the most active of the rioters " are in custody; and no doubt every ex- " ertion will be used to discover the authors " of the placards which have led to all the " mischief, that they may at least be held " up to the merited detestation of their fel- " low townsmen." — Another Letter adds; " By 12 o'clock in the day some " thousands of the mob had taken posses- " sion of St. Ann's-square. One of the " town demagogues mounted a temporary " rostrum in the middle of the square, and " read aloud the *Resolutions agreed to at* " *the last Common Hall*; *every one of which* " *were unanimously re-passed amidst the* " *loudest acclamations*. Matters were thus " proceeding when suddenly arrived from " the barracks the regiment of Scotch " Greys, and the Cumberland regiment of " Militia. The Riot Act was immediately " read, and time allowed for the mob to " disperse: and in fifteen minutes after- " wards not ten persons could be found to- " gether in this quarter of the town. Ne- " ver did soldiers perform their duty with " more propriety. They were frequently

" provoked to acts of violence, but con- " ducted themselves, notwithstanding, with " great moderation and forbearance towards " the rabble. *No lives were lost that I* " *have heard of, but several were wounded* " *by the sabre*. From twelve o'clock in the " day all the shops and warehouses were " shut up."

More Troops! "More Troops!" said Burke, when, in the height of his malignant joy, he was surveying the troubles of the early part of the French Revolution. He then talked of the employment of troops in the interior of a country as a sign of a bad government. He laughed at the National Assembly, because they did so employ troops. "Every thing," said he, in his first Letter on the French Revolution, "Every thing depends on the army, in a government like your's; for, you have industriously destroyed all the opinions and prejudices, and, as far as in you lay, all the instincts which support government. Nothing is left to your government but force. The distribution of your army is, in a great measure, made with a view to internal coercion. You must rule by an army; and, yet the assertion is still ringing in our ears, that troops ought not to fire upon the citizens. These are your rights of man!" — And, then he seems to have gnashed his teeth and to have grinned with ecstasy at the thought of seeing the people of France annihilated, merely because they were endeavouring to regain their rights, for it was impossible that he should hate them for any other cause. I wish he had lived till now. I should have wished him no other punishment than to see France in her present state. — What, then, it may be asked, would I not have the soldiers employed to keep the people in order? I do not say that. That is quite another question, and one, which I shall, perhaps, enter upon fully hereafter. At present, it will be quite sufficient to point out the fact. — It has appeared rather odd to me, that the Local Militia and the Volunteer Corps have not been called out upon these occasions. It is now a long while since Nottingham has employed troops, and we have read of their having been marched thither from very great distances. Now, this seemed strange to me, seeing that there cannot be less than about ten thousand of the Local Militia in Nottinghamshire, ready upon the spot. Why send for horse and foot to such a distance? Why send for the Berkshire Militia to go to quell a riot in Nottinghamshire, when there were in Not-

tinghamshire already ten thousand Local Militiamen? I will leave the COURIER to answer this question. And, when his hand is in, he will oblige me very much, if he will have the goodness to explain to me what is meant by the Welsh Militia having marched back to Falmouth with the arms of the Stannary regiment to lodge them in a castle there? This has excited a good deal of attention: one regiment marching off with the arms of another.—However, here I shall leave the matter, and proceed to my third proposed head, namely, to answer the remarks which the hireling writers have published upon the subject of these riots, and particularly with regard to the riot at Manchester. I shall take passage by passage, and answer these commentators; and, then leave the world to judge of their views. I first take up the COURIER of the tenth instant, which begin with these words:

*We have inserted, in a subsequent column, two of several letters we received from Manchester this morning, relative to some riotous proceedings there last Wednesday. In some papers we expect to see those proceedings exaggerated and misrepresented.*

Now, why did you expect to see any exaggerations and misrepresentations of this affair? What should put that into your head? Is it not evident, that you had disguised part of the truth, and that you expected that it would come out through some other channel? If you had had truth to state, you would have expressed no apprehension of a difference in future publications, relating to the same event. Accordingly when the truth did come out, we found that the people had been cut with swords, which you took care not to tell us of. There were several other truths, which you wished to disguise; for you did not tell us of the reading of the City Resolutions, and the passing of them by the people, the real people, of Manchester. These Resolutions you had abused; and, of course, you wished to disguise from your readers the fact of their having been read and applauded and passed at St. Anne's Square at Manchester.

*And these misrepresentations go forth to France and foreign countries, encouraging a belief, that we are a divided and disaffected people, ready to rise against our Government, and so indignant against the war as to submit to any terms for the purpose of procuring peace. They say to BUONAPARTE, that if he continues the war he must ruin us, and thus these self-styled advocates for peace are in reality doing every thing in*

*their power to indispose BUONAPARTE to make peace. We have at this moment before us the Moniteur of the 3d April, in which there is a long article, faithfully translated from an Opposition Paper of the 24th ult.; the tendency of which is to assure BUONAPARTE that he has only to persevere in his system, and we shall be forced to recall our troops from the Peninsula, and be involved in all the miseries of a civil war.*

So, you do not wish that the Emperor of France should know what passes here of a disagreeable nature? You wish to keep it all in huggar-muggar. Your's is, and long has been, a system of huggar-muggar. But, what is your charge against those whom you have in your eye? Why, it is this: that they send misrepresentations to the Emperor with regard to the state and the disposition of the people of this country. Well, and what then? If he believes them, they deceive him; and would you not wish the enemy to be deceived? Those who send the enemy true information may be accused of being his friends; but, surely, those cannot who send him false information. So that, if this part of your charge were true, it would make against the whole train of your complaints, instead of for them.—But, pray where have you read any thing to justify you in saying, that there are, in this country, persons who represent the people as ready to submit to peace on *any terms*? You have seen this in none of the hand-bills from Manchester; you have seen it in none of the Resolutions of the City of London; you have seen it in no publication whatever. But, this is the old accusation. This is what has been asserted as to all those, who have wished, at any time, to see peace restored; and this is one of the means that have been employed for suppressing the sentiments of the people, and for perpetuating a war, in which so many persons find their advantage.—You say, that the Moniteur has translated a passage from a London paper, in which Napoleon is told, that he has only to pursue his present measures to compel the minister to recall our troops from the peninsula, in order to keep down insurrection at home.—No; he was not told this. He was told nothing: but, our minister was told, that, if he pursued his present measures, such would be the consequence. This was what the passage said; and, must not any one find fault with the measures of the minister, lest encouragement should thereby be given to the enemy? Adopt this maxim, and you silence all the opponents of the minister in a moment. They can open their lips no

more; for every thing they say against his measures must, of course, give the enemy encouragement; unless the measures be changed, which, according to you, no one can expect, as you hold all those measures to be the wisest that can be thought of.

*The system of endeavouring to inflame and mislead the people spreads from the capital to the provinces, and is returned from the provinces to the capital. Is there a meeting proposed for one object—it is industriously represented as a meeting to oppress the laborious part of the community.*

What do you mean by “inflaming” and “misleading?” You have not shown, that any thing, said against the measures opposed, was false; and, if truth will inflame the people, it is right to inflame them. It is hard to say to what a degree of tame ness you would wish to see the people reduced. Apparently, you would wish to see their blood become as thin as spring water. They, according to you, are never to feel any heat, at any thing, except in the cause of “no-popery.” You can remember, perhaps, when the Church and King mobs burnt Tom Paine in effigy. It was not then thought that the people were wrongly inflamed. If, however, you can shew, that they have now been inflamed by hypocritical cries, I shall be amongst the first to condemn the act. But, I must confess, that I have seen no such attempts.

—What do you mean by the words “one object?” If a meeting is called for *one object*, it is represented that it is for the purpose of oppressing the people. This representation may be true, or false. It depends upon what that “one object” is, and here we have the one which you have in view.

—*We have a specimen in these proceedings at Manchester. A meeting was called to express attachment to the person of the Regent, and assurances of zeal for the support of his Government. The following among many other printed hand-bills, was immediately circulated among the spinners, weavers, &c. in Manchester and the neighbouring parts.—“Now or NEVER!—Those Inhabitants who do not wish for an Increase of Taxes and Poor Rates—an Advance in the Price of Provisions—a Scarcity of Work—and a Reduction of Wages—will not fail to go to the Meeting on Wednesday morning next, at the Exchange, and OPPOSE THE 154 PERSONS who have called you together; and you will then do right to express your detestation of the conduct of those Men who have brought this Country to its present dis*

“tressed State, and are entailing Misery on Thousands of our industrious Mechanics.—SPEAK YOUR MINDS NOW, before it is too late; let not the Prince and the People be deceived as to your real sentiments. Speak and act boldly and firmly, but above all, be PEACEABLE.”

Here we have your “one object,” then; and there can be no doubt, in my opinion, of the propriety of opposing that object. It was to express the approbation of the people of Manchester and its neighbourhood of the conduct of the present ministers; for that is what is meant by “the Prince’s government.” And, what could be more insulting to the distressed people than to call upon them to meet for such a purpose? It was calling upon them to meet to say that they approved of all those measures, by which they had been brought into their present situation, as far at least as relates to the want of employment amongst the manufacturers, and also as far as relates to the rates and taxes. It is well known, that, before the war against France began, the taxes collected in England and Wales amounted to only about 15 millions annually; and it is equally well known, that they now amount to 60 millions annually. To approve, therefore, of the men who have carried on this war, and who persevere in it, is certainly to approve of that which creates taxes and paupers, and which, in one way at least, raises the price of provisions.—It may, by you, be said, that the war is full of wisdom; that its benefits are worth more than they cost. That is matter for argument with those whose minds are not made up on the subject; but, be that as it may, the fact of the war being fertile in the production of taxes no man can deny.

—But, at any rate, the person who wrote this handbill had as good a right to express his sentiments as the 154 had; and, if they did not wish to be answered, they should have held their tongues.

Such are the attempts made to delude and irritate the lower classes, and direct their hatred against their own Government instead of against Buonaparté. They who make them, know that the evils which we suffer, could not be cured, not cured but aggravated, by peace at the present moment—they feel that the war must be continued, and they would raise a civil war to palsy the foreign war. They fear that our glorious efforts in the Peninsula may snatch the devoted victim from the grasp of the tyger, and they wish to create a necessity

for recalling our troops. With them war, instead of being another name for glory, means nothing but misery, and peace, which at present is only synonymous for submission, nothing but plenty.

Here is a constellation of absurdities and falsehoods.—This handbill, you say, was an attempt “to delude and irritate the lower classes.” What was the following handbill, which appeared at Manchester at the same time?

*England expects every man to do his duty!!!—Should you not this day give your support to the Prince Regent, you may, in a very short time, expect a revival of the days of Bloody Queen Mary, when your ancestors were tied to a stake, and burnt alive. The active opposers of the present Government have pledged themselves to sanction the Popish Religion, and, as Buonaparté is the head of that religion, your universal cry should be “No Pope Buonaparté!”*

This, I suppose, was not intended “to delude and irritate the lower classes.” This was said in sober truth! I need say no more on this, only just to remark, that, you see, two can play at handbills as well as at any thing else. And in this game, as well as in most others, those who are beaten are very apt to cry out foul play.—But, to return to the former passage. When you complain of endeavours to direct the hatred of the people against “their own government,” you mean *the ministers*; and I do not allow that the ministers ought to be called the government. Our government consists of King, Lords, and Commons, and I do not look upon all these as being comprised in the ministers. Indeed, we may love the government, and hate the ministers at the same time. Nay, as we have seen, the king may be hated, detested, execrated, he and all his ministers and judges; and he may be driven out of the country; and yet the people, and those who drive him away in particular, may love the government.—I do not like to see these words confounded, though to confound them has long been the fashion with every ministry and their dependents, and for reasons too obvious to need pointing out. Nay, they look upon themselves as *the country* too; and, whoever opposes them, they and their dependents have no scruple to call “enemies of the country.”—But, you find fault with the opponents of the ministers, that they direct the hatred of the people against “their own government” (that is, the ministers), “instead of against Buonaparté.”—

Really, I am at a loss to dive into the sense of this. Why should we, who disapprove of the measures of the ministers, endeavour to turn the hatred of the people against Buonaparté instead of against the ministers? We may hate them both, if there be sufficient reason. It does not follow, that a man is not to hate the one because he hates the other. We may, if we find reason, hate each of them for different things; and, therefore, I can by no means allow that Buonaparté is to be a ‘scape goat for the ministers.—Perhaps, the meaning may be this: “You complain of the evils occasioned by the war; and, as Buonaparté is the cause of the war, you ought to hate him and not the ministers.” Mr. Perceval said the same thing the other night in the debate about the famous *new barracks* that are to cost us such a pretty round sum of money.—To be sure, if Buonaparté would give up to us; or, if he would be so complaisant as to be beaten by us; or, if he would be so kind as to die, the war would, perhaps, come to an end. But, it is a little too much to make a great out-cry against him because he will do neither. And, as to making peace, I am sure he has made offers enough to enter upon negociation. He did it in 1806; he did it again in 1808; and again in 1810; or, at least, so his official paper declares; and which declaration has never, that I know of, been contradicted. His *terms*, I shall be told, were intolerable. That may be; but, still he did propose to treat; and, whatever the terms might be, he had a right to propose them; whether he was arrogant in the proposition, we shall see in the end; but, certainly, as far as we have hitherto gone, the terms do not seem to have been upon the mend.—At any rate, what is the sense of directing the hatred of the people against him? We cannot get at him. We cannot touch a hair of his head. If, indeed, we could get hold of him by an *Ex-Officio Information*; if we could once get him before a special jury for his libels against our ministers; then it would be worth while to expend a little ink in exciting hatred against him. But, while we have no more power over him than we have over the seven stars, I cannot see the utility of railing against him; unless we use him as a sort of *Tub to that Whale*, the people, to draw the latter off from the ministers.—We are next told, that peace would be very far, indeed, from removing the evils we complain of, but that, on the contrary, it would aggtavate them.—Now,

then, you hypocrite, how came you to tell us, in your paper a few days before, that the war had produced so many evils in France? You told us, that, in that country, it had made corn scarce by taking away the men, and leaving only women to cultivate the land. To what an extent must your impudence have gone, when you can coolly thus blow hot and cold with the same mouth and almost with the same breath. As to this point your fellow-labourer, the *Times*, comes to your aid, and says :

*Let not any one remind the people of their difficulties, and they will the less feel them. We did hope, that we should only have had the disturbances in our enemy's dominions to record: there is there some cause for them. The French have been harassed by wars with Italy, with Germany, with Switzerland, with Russia, with Spain. We provoke no contests, and only defend ourselves against the common enemy that has assailed all other nations as well as us.*

Oh! There, in France, there is *cause* for disturbances! Now, how is this made out? It is easy to assert it; but how is it attempted to be shown? Why, thus: "the French have been harassed by wars "with Italy, with Germany, with Switzerland, with Russia, with Spain." —Good! As if we had not been at war with all these nations except Switzerland, with whom it is almost physically impossible for us to be at war. We not only have been, but we are, at war with Holland, the Hans Towns, Denmark, Italy, Naples, and, though last, not least, France, and are in a sort of half war with America. So that, really, I am afraid, that this ground of justification of disturbers of the peace in France may have two edges to it.—Yes, yes; but "we provoke no "contests." Ours is a very modest and inoffensive government. Always very slow to get into wars. That all the world must allow; and, I suppose, that this writer is quite prepared to show in what way "self- "defence" impelled us to make war upon all the kingdoms that we have conquered in the East.—The next passage is rather of a pathetic cast.

*We trust that the good sense and patriotism which have hitherto steered the great mass of the people through the storm, and rendered our dear country the only free and happy spot in the world will yet continue to guide and direct them—We shall then be secure within, we shall be victorious without, and we shall fix the fortunes and free-*

*dom of our empire upon imperishable foundations.*

Upon reading this, one would think that the writer had the ague fit on him. He does not talk of populace and lower-classes and rabble and mob here; he appeals to "the good sense and patriotism of the "people;" and, no wonder, for he soon afterwards speaks of "a storm" that we are in. He comes almost down upon his marrow-bones and talks of "our dear "country, the only free and happy spot in "the world," and, I dare say, he does make a very good thing of it. But, he "trusts, he only "trusts," that we "shall "be" secure within, and victorious without, and fix our fortunes upon imperishable foundations. It appears to be rather doubtful with him. He only trusts that these things will take place.—Mark how he rises the next day, when he tells us that the boys and women at Manchester have been defeated, and that the woman has been shot at Carlisle.—Mark how he rises in his tone!

*In the name of the British people, we must say, that they deserve a better return for those noble and high-minded principles that have raised the country to so high a pitch of glory and renown—that having ruined the naval power of every other nation, are now carrying our military force to an equal height with our naval—that having ensured the security of our own territories, are protecting others, and having chased the enemy from every other part of the globe, are making him feel the power and prowess of our arms upon that Continent, which he so arrogantly claimed as his own. If this be not a proud position, if this be not a recompense for the sacrifices we have made and are still making—if to be free and safe within, and victorious and renowned without, does not content us, we are at a loss to know what recompense will be deemed sufficient, and what will content us.*

Here is a change in only twenty-four hours!—Well; but, if this be true, now, what becomes of all your pretences for not making peace? What danger, if this be true, would there be in opening negotiations for peace? If you have beaten Napoleon; if you have "ruined the naval "power of every other nation;" if this modest assertion be true; if your military power is now becoming the rival of your naval power; if you have secured your own territory; if you have chased the enemy about so; why are you afraid of his power? Why talk of "his ambition?"—Hark

ye, wiseacre ! you have overshot the mark here !—It is time to conclude ; but these two more passages, one in the COURIER and one in the TIMES, I must notice, because they contain matter of a very curious nature. The passages relate solely to what took place at Manchester.

*What do the rioters mean ? Would they give up their name and nation as Holland has done ? And if not, how are they to preserve them but by fighting ? Spain was at peace,—and has she thereby kept out Buonaparte ? Holland was at peace,—and has she by peace been enabled to save herself ?*—TIMES, 11th April.

*What was the pretext for this outrage at Manchester ? Because a meeting was called to assure the Regent that the persons attending it were attached to his person and wished to support his government. If persons do not want a Regent ruling in the name of his father and of the constitution according to which he is to govern us and does govern us—what do they want ? Do they want such a government as Buonaparté's ?*—COURIER, 11th April.

What do you say ? Must we fight for our very *name*, or lose it as Holland (as you say) has ? I thought, that, but just now, we were the conquerors of the universe ; that we had ruined every naval power in the world, and that we were in a fair way of getting the continent out of the hands of Buonaparté. And, are we now told, that it is necessary for us to fight even to *preserve our name* ? Yes, we are now told, that we have no means but fighting left to prevent the very name of England from being blotted out for ever.—This is comforting intelligence, to be sure. But, we are again told, that *peace* would not save us, and the cases of Spain and Holland are instanced. Who has asked for peace ? Did the people of Manchester say a word about peace ? No : why, then, are we continually told that peace would be useless ?—But, what is this moral to be drawn from the fate of Spain and Holland ? They were *at peace* with France, we are told. Very true ; but they did not choose to remain so. They joined in the league against France with the King of England, the King of Prussia, the (then) Emperor of Germany, the Emperor of Russia, the Elector of Hanover, the King of Naples, the King of Sardinia, the Queen of Portugal, the Dukes of Parma, Modena, and Tuscany, the Republic of Venice, the Grand Seignior, and the Pope.—Spain and Holland did not choose to remain at peace. They were *at peace*, it is true ; but their

fate was fixed long before Buonaparté became much known in the world. Their example, therefore, is worth nothing at all. But, what is meant by citing it, unless the object be to bar the way of all thoughts about peace ? To prevent the people from opening their lips about peace ? And this is the more worthy of remark, as no one has written or spoken in favour of peace. Not a word has been said about peace at any public meeting ; and, yet the hireling prints all burst out, at once, in full cry, against peace !—At the close of the last-quoted passage, the people of Manchester are asked, *whether they wish to get rid of the Regent and to have Buonaparté in his stead.* And, what ground is there for asking them this question ? Have they said, that they do not like the Regent ? No where have they said this ; no where, that I can see, do they hint such an idea. But, they are accused of it, because it was manifest, that they were prepared to disapprove of an address in praise of his ministers. And this is the constant practice, as it has been ever since the year 1793. Every one who is not ready to applaud the conduct of the minister of the day, is represented as wishing to see the country in the hands of the enemy ; that is to say, he is exhibited as a traitor. Thus the people of Manchester are to be viewed as traitors, because they evidently intended to oppose an address in praise of the Regent's ministers.—It is, however, to be noted, that the people of Manchester had no opportunity of expressing their sentiments. The proposed meeting was not held ; those who had called it were afraid to let it assemble. And, then they accuse of a riotous spirit those whom they had balked. In consequence of what did the people collect together ? Why, in consequence of an advertisement of the head officers of the town, inviting them to collect. They do collect ; and then they are told that there is to be no address proposed to them. And they are called rabble and mob, because they came in great numbers ! The advertisement was, no doubt, intended as a sham. It was supposed that hardly any body would come to the meeting, and the address would then have been passed by the packed few, and would have been sent forth to the world as the unanimous sentiment of the people of the populous town of Manchester. That, no doubt, was the design of the advertisement ; but, that design was defeated by the people pouring forth.—It is now stated, in the news-papers, that the persons who advertised for ad-

dressers, have since "met at the *Police Office*, and passed their Address *unanimously*." At the *Police Office*! The *Barracks*, I should have thought, would have been a more convenient place. A commendatory Address, passed under such circumstances, must inspire great confidence to be sure; it must be very flattering to those to whom it is carried. There would, of course, be perfect *unanimity* at the *Police Office*!—Before I conclude, I cannot help expressing my decided approbation, my admiration, of the conduct of those who issued the hand-bills in opposition to the addressers, and also of those who harangued the people and put to them the Resolutions of the City of London; in short, I approve of and admire all that was done by the people, *except the violence they committed*, of which I disapprove, and I hope, that we shall hear of no more riots in any part of the country.—With the exception of the acts of violence, nothing was ever conducted in a better manner. The humbug advertisement was made to call the people together in reality. When the authors of it saw that the people were really coming, they slunk back, and would have no meeting. The people then met in a Square of the Town, and there passed the Resolutions of the London Common-Hall, directly opposite in their object to the intended Address. And, had not the people *a right* to do this? Because they did this, are they to be set down as men *wishing for the sway of Buonaparté*? Because they did this, are they to be represented as wishing to get rid of the Regent and to have the government of the Emperor Napoleon? And, are those the *friends* of the Regent, who suggest, or publish, such imputations against the people? These hireling writers complain that their opponents convey intelligence to Buonaparté; but, who conveys him, or can convey him, intelligence so encouraging as this? Who can tell him of any thing so agreeable as that a part, at least, of the people of England, are suspected of wishing for his sway instead of that of the Regent? What should we say, if we were to hear the French writers accusing any part of the people of France of a wish to shake off the sway of Napoleon and to put themselves under our Regent?—In conclusion, let me express a hope, that I

have now said enough to induce the hirelings to abstain, in future, from openly exulting at the existence of scarcity in France, and also from justifying riots in that country, on account of such scarcity. It is very well for them to indulge their impotent malice in private; but, to do it in public, is, as I have shown, dangerous in its tendency; and, therefore, they should be made to abstain, even at the hazard of being suffocated in their gall.

It was my intention to have offered to the reader some further remarks relative to her Royal Highness, the Princess Regent; but, they must now be postponed till my next.

WM. COBBETT.

*State Prison, Newgate,  
Friday, 17th April, 1812.*

#### OFFICIAL PAPERS.

FRANCE.—*Reports laid before the Conservative Senate on the 10th of March, 1812.*

(Continued from page 480.)

Nevertheless, whilst this institution will completely protect the French empire against the idea of an attack, all the depots and fifth battalions, being no longer occupied in forming garrisons or defending the country, will feed the active army with more activity and efficacy. This will in reality be equivalent to an augmentation of the troops of the line. It is placing 100,000 more Frenchmen under the banners of your Majesty. But these men will be renewed every six years, by the conscription for the army. This augmentation will cause very little addition to the losses, because these troops will be seldom exposed but to the ordinary chances of mortality. It will likewise cause an increase in expense of 48 millions; but this expense cannot be placed in competition with the immense advantages which will result from it.—This institution is eminently conservative and national: it is useful and necessary. Frenchmen are willing to make every sacrifice to acquire the liberty of the seas; they know that they must be armed, or this grand measure will not be accomplished.

(To be continued.)

Published by R. BAGSHAW, Brydges-Street, Covent-Garden.

LONDON: Printed by J. M'Creery, Black Horse-Court, Fleet-street.